IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

David Anthony Rhone,

Petitioner,

v.

David Shinn, et al.,

Respondents.

No. CV-20-00427-PHX-DWL

ORDER

Pending before the Court are Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 1) and the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") of the United States Magistrate Judge (Doc. 33). The R&R, which was issued on July 15, 2021, recommended that the petition be dismissed with prejudice and further provided that "[t]he parties shall have fourteen days from the date of service of a copy of this recommendation within which to file specific written objections with the Court." (Doc. 33 at 12.)

Here, no such objections have been filed. Thus, the Court accepts the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. *See, e.g., Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985) ("It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings."); *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) ("[N]o review is required of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation unless objections are filed."). *See also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)

("[T]he district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not otherwise.").

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the R&R's recommended disposition (Doc. 33) is accepted, that the Petition (Doc. 1) is dismissed with prejudice, and that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability and leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal be **DENIED** because dismissal of the petition is justified by a plain procedural bar and jurists of reason would not find the procedural ruling debatable.

Dated this 11th day of August, 2021.

Dominic W. Lanza United States District Judge